

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

STANLEY J. CATERBONE and
ADVANCED MEDIA GROUP,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY, or
NSA; DEFENSE ADVANCED
RESEARCH PROJECT AGENCY, or
DARPA; DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE;
DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, or
DIA; CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
AGENCY, or CIA; FEDERAL BUREAU
OF INVESTIGATION, or FBI; UNITED
STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE;
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
GENERAL; PENNSYLVANIA STATE
POLICE; PENNSYLVANIA ATTORNEY
GENERAL; LANCASTER COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS; LANCASTER
COUNTY CRISIS INTERVENTION;
LANCASTER COUNTY SHERIFF
DEPARTMENT; LANCASTER MAYOR
RICK GRAY; LANCASTER CITY
BUREAU OF POLICE; DETECTIVE
CLARK BEARINGER, LANCASTER
CITY BUREAU OF POLICE,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 17-867

ORDER

AND NOW, this 28th day of March, 2017, after considering the complaint and amended complaint filed by the *pro se* plaintiff, Stanley J. Caterbone, on behalf of himself and Advanced Media Group (Doc. Nos. 1-1 – 1-6; 1-10 – 1-17), Caterbone’s “notice of appeal,” which the court has interpreted as a motion for reconsideration of Magistrate Judge Carlson’s January 9, 2017 report and recommendation (Doc. No. 1-25); and after also considering Caterbone’s (1) “Motion

to File Exhibit DVD” (Doc. No. 2), (2) “Motion to File Statement ‘Enough is Enough,’” which also contained a request for permission to file documents electronically (Doc. No. 3), and (3) “Motion to File Exhibit Titled ‘Letter to Huntingdon Bank Andrew Grimmit re March 7 Liquidation Offer March 17, 2017’” (Doc. No. 4); and for the reasons set forth in the separately-filed memorandum opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The amended complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** except as otherwise specified in the court’s memorandum opinion and in this order;

2. To the extent that the plaintiffs sought preliminary injunctive relief, the request is **DENIED AS MOOT** in light of the court’s dismissal of the amended complaint;

3. Caterbone’s claims based on the March 8, 2016 incident that took place in Maryland, as described further in the court’s memorandum opinion, are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to Caterbone filing a complaint against appropriate defendants in the District of Maryland. Caterbone may not file an amended pleading in this court based on those claims;

4. Caterbone’s claims based on the events surrounding his involuntary commitment in July 2015 and February 2016, as described further in the court’s memorandum opinion, are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to Caterbone filing a second amended complaint within thirty (30) days of the date of this order as to those claims only. Any amended complaint shall identify all defendants in the caption of the pleading. Additionally, any amended complaint shall, as clearly and briefly as possible, state the factual basis for Caterbone’s claims against each defendant, state the basis for the court’s jurisdiction over the claims, and state the relief that Caterbone seeks from this court. If Caterbone fails to file a second amended complaint within

the thirty (30)-day period set forth above, the court may dismiss this case without any further notice to him;

5. The “notice of appeal,” which the court has interpreted as a motion for reconsideration of Magistrate Judge Carlson’s January 9, 2017 report and recommendation (Doc. No. 1-25), is **DENIED**;

6. The “Motion to File Exhibit DVD” (Doc. No. 2) is **DENIED**;

7. The “Motion to File Statement ‘Enough is Enough,’” which also contained a request for permission to file documents electronically (Doc. No. 3), is **DENIED**; and

8. The “Motion to File Exhibit Titled ‘Letter to Huntingdon Bank Andrew Grimmit re March 7 Liquidation Offer March 17, 2017’” (Doc. No. 4) is **DENIED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Edward G. Smith
EDWARD G. SMITH, J.